



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/665,097	09/16/2003	John Barrus	20412-07972	6194
758	7590	03/21/2007	EXAMINER	
FENWICK & WEST LLP SILICON VALLEY CENTER 801 CALIFORNIA STREET MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041			HILLERY, NATHAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	03/21/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/665,097	BARRUS ET AL.
	Examiner Nathan Hillary	Art Unit 2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-79 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-79 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/3/07, 2/6/07.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: RCE filed on 12/27/06.
2. Claims 1-79 are currently pending in the case, with claims 1, 42, 44, and 63 being the dependent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 2, 19, 20, 27 – 32, 35 – 39, 42 – 45, 54, 55, 59, 60, 63, 64, 73 and 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Davies et al. (US 20020085759 A1).

Regarding independent claim 1, Cooper in view of Cotte teaches:

Davies et al. teach that an action processor reads the bitmap received from the scanner (paragraph block 0044), which meet the limitation of **receiving an image of a document index;**

Davies et al. teach that once the glyph sticker pattern has been located, the data within the glyph field is then decoded. The data is then associated with a desired service (paragraph block 0052), which meet the limitation of **locating, on the document index image, an image of a first sticker specifying an action;**

Davies et al. teach that while the user interface tag of the invention is illustrated in FIG. 1 as an adhesive sticker capable of being applied to documents, it should be observed that the pattern may also be applied to cover sheets capable of being associated with a document and further capable of bearing machine-readable information (paragraph block 0035), which meet the limitation of **identifying a first document based on the location of the first action sticker on the document index page**; and

Davies et al. teach that a system permits a user to specify an action or a service to be performed simply by applying a sticker to the document and placing it into a bin to be scanned (paragraph block 0012), which meet the limitation of **performing the specified first action on the identified first document**.

Regarding dependent claim 2:

Davies et al. teach that the present invention uses a scheme of encoded tags, such as adhesive stickers or labels (paragraph block 0012), which meet the limitation of **the first action sticker comprises a removable self-adhesive sticker**.

Regarding dependent claim 19:

Davies et al. teach that exemplary services may include, but would not be limited to, "scan to document repository," "scan and send via e-mail," "scan and fax," "scan and print copies," and so forth (paragraph block 0038), which meet the limitation of **the specified first action comprises one selected from the group consisting of:**

printing; e-mailing; faxing; grouping; reordering; playing; ungrouping; and deleting.

Regarding dependent claim 20:

Davies et al. teach that an action processor reads the bitmap received from the scanner, identifies and decodes the glyph sticker, and accesses the database server to determine the identity of the user. The desired service may be inferred simply from the identity of the user (paragraph block 0044), which meet the limitation of **the specified first action comprises specifying an access level for the first stored document.**

Regarding dependent claim 27:

Davies et al. teach that based on the user's desired service, the action processor then causes the desired action to be performed, which may involve the generation of a transformed document by an output device. The output device is characterized generally here, but as discussed above, may comprise a hardcopy printer, a facsimile machine (or modem capable of sending fax messages), a network connection for e-mail, a connection to a document repository, a digital storage device or an aggregation of some or all of these and other functions (paragraph block 0045), which meet the limitation of **the specified first action comprises transmitting the identified first stored document to a destination, the method further comprising: determining a destination.**

Regarding dependent claim 28:

Davies et al. teach that an exemplary data structure embodied by the glyph field includes a service code. Accordingly, the service code can represent up to 256 different possible actions, transformations, and services. Exemplary services may include, but would not be limited to, "scan to document repository," "scan and send via e-mail," "scan and fax," "scan and print copies," and so forth. An indicated service may, without limitation, include a plurality of actions (e.g., scan, then recognize characters, then e-mail the text), and may also involve transformation of the document from hardcopy to electronic form, and possibly back to hardcopy form (paragraph block 0038), which meet the limitation of **determining a destination comprises receiving user input specifying a destination.**

Regarding dependent claim 29:

Davies et al. teach that an exemplary data structure embodied by the glyph field includes a service code. Accordingly, the service code can represent up to 256 different possible actions, transformations, and services. Exemplary services may include, but would not be limited to, "scan to document repository," "scan and send via e-mail," "scan and fax," "scan and print copies," and so forth. An indicated service may, without limitation, include a plurality of actions (e.g., scan, then recognize characters, then e-mail the text), and may also involve transformation of the document from hardcopy to electronic form, and possibly back to hardcopy form (paragraph block 0038), which meet the limitation of **determining a destination comprises reading an indicator of a**

destination from the image of the document index.

Regarding dependent claim 30:

Davies et al. teach that an exemplary data structure embodied by the glyph field includes a service code. Accordingly, the service code can represent up to 256 different possible actions, transformations, and services. Exemplary services may include, but would not be limited to, "scan to document repository," "scan and send via e-mail," "scan and fax," "scan and print copies," and so forth. An indicated service may, without limitation, include a plurality of actions (e.g., scan, then recognize characters, then e-mail the text), and may also involve transformation of the document from hardcopy to electronic form, and possibly back to hardcopy form (paragraph block 0038), which meet the limitation of **determining a destination comprises reading an indicator of a destination from the first action sticker.**

Regarding dependent claim 31:

Davies et al. teach that other services may require a differently coded argument (e.g., "scan and fax" followed by an argument of "2" may represent a command to fax the document to the user's home fax number, as opposed to an office fax number or, perhaps, an alternate office fax number, both of which would have different argument numbers (paragraph block 0039), which meet the limitation of **determining a destination comprises determining at least one selected from the group consisting of: an e-mail address; a fax number; a uniform resource locator; a**

telephone number; and a mailing address.

Regarding dependent claim 32:

Davies et al. teach that an action processor reads the bitmap received from the scanner (paragraph block 0044), which meet the limitation of **receiving an image of a document index comprises scanning the document index.**

Regarding dependent claim 35:

Davies et al. teach that once the glyph sticker pattern has been located, the data within the glyph field is then decoded. The data is then associated with a desired service, and the service is performed (paragraph block 0052), which meet the limitation of **determining the specified action by reading the first action sticker.**

Regarding dependent claim 36:

Davies et al. teach that it will be observed that any recoverable printed representation of digital information, including but not limited to optically recognizable alphanumeric characters can also be used in alternative embodiments of the invention to similar effect (paragraph block 0036), which meet the limitation of **determining the specified action by performing optical character recognition on the first action sticker.**

Regarding dependent claim 37:

Davies et al. teach that it will be appreciated that minor variations of this method, readily apparent to those skilled in the art, may also be used to identify and locate various parallelogram, rhombus, trapezoid, and irregular quadrilateral patterns in addition to rectangles and rectangle-like shapes (paragraph block 0072), which meet the limitation of **determining the specified action by determining a shape of the first action sticker.**

Regarding dependent claim 38:

Davies et al. teach that the method is operative on monochromatic images. If the digitized image is in some other format (such as color or grayscale), it should first, as a precursor to the method set forth in FIG. 6, be converted to a binary format, typically via a threshold function or by dithering (paragraph block 0054), which meet the limitation of **determining the specified action by determining a color of the first action sticker.**

Regarding dependent claim 39:

Davies et al. teach that the glyph sticker pattern includes several important attributes. A glyph field contains a printed representation of digital data used to perform the goals of the invention; it should be noted that the glyph field of FIG. 1 is shown as using Xerox DataGlyphs (paragraph block 0036), which meet the limitation of **determining the specified action by reading a machine-readable icon on the first action sticker.**

Regarding dependent claim 43:

Davies et al. teach that the present invention uses a scheme of encoded tags, such as adhesive stickers or labels, to serve as the primary user interface in a hardcopy document processing system. Such a system would permit a user to specify an action or a service to be performed simply by applying a sticker to the document and placing it into a bin to be scanned (paragraph block 0012), which meet the limitation of **receiving input specifying an action comprises receiving input via a user interface.**

Regarding claims 42, 44, 45, 54, 55, 59, 60, 63, 64, 73 and 74, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claims 1, 2, 19, 20 and 27 and are rejected along the same rationale.

Claims Rejection – 35 U.S.C. 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3 – 18, 21 – 26, 33, 34, 40, 41, 46 – 53, 56 – 58, 61, 62, 65 – 72 and 75 – 79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies et al. (US 20020085759 A1), as applied to claims 1, 44 and 63 above and in further view of Cooper et al. (5,680,223) and Cotte et al. (5,499,108).

Regarding dependent claim 3:

It is noted that the term "collection," and the related term "sub-collection," are not specially defined in the application. From the specification and claims, the Examiner believes the terms to have been intended by the applicants to be used in their usual and ordinary meaning, such as: "a group of objects or works to be seen or kept together." "The American Heritage College dictionary," definition 2 of "collection," Houghton Mifflin Company, Fourth Edition, 2002. As used in the context of a computer or computer stored documents, the term "collection" is believed by the Examiner to be the same as a file. See, "Microsoft Computer Dictionary," Fifth Edition, Microsoft Press, 2002, definition of "file" as follows, in relevant part: "A complete named collection of information, such as a program, a set of data used by a program, or a user-created document." Accordingly, as used in this application, the limitation term "collection," including a "sub-collection," will be read consistent with the definition of a computer "file" for the remainder of this Office Action.

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cotte, col. 2, line 29 through col. 3, line 54, generally. And, see, Cotte, col. 10, lines 28-57, teaching a file, which is a collection. See also, Cooper, col. 1, line 8 through col. 4, line 59, teaching manipulation of a collection. See also, Cooper, col. 1, line 8 through col. 14, line 11, teaching collections identified on the coversheet.

Although Davies et al. do not explicitly teach the limitations, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the

inventions of Cooper et al. and Cotte et al. with that of Davies et al. because such a combination would provide the users of Davies et al. with the benefit of an input device using scanning technology that has a zero footprint of space consumed on the surface of a workstation (Cotte) and a method and system for assigning a meaningful user-selected file label to files which uses existing peripheral devices (Cooper).

Regarding dependent claim 4:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cooper, col. 1, line 8 through col. 14, line 11, teaching collections identified on the coversheet.

Although Davies et al. do not explicitly teach the limitations, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the inventions of Cooper et al. and Cotte et al. with that of Davies et al. because such a combination would provide the users of Davies et al. with the benefit of an input device using scanning technology that has a zero footprint of space consumed on the surface of a workstation (Cotte) and a method and system for assigning a meaningful user-selected file label to files which uses existing peripheral devices (Cooper).

Regarding dependent claim 5:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. The Examiner takes official notice of the fact that "thumbnail" images were a well known and widely used icons representing software applications and functions and it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a thumbnail representation of a document on a document image index coversheet for purposes of giving visual cues to the user as to the content of the documents represented. See, Bloomberg (U.S. Patent 5,761,686, issued June 2, 1998), col. 3, lines 7-31, teaching that the use of thumbnail images as icons representing documents in applications and functions was well known in the art at the time of the invention.

Although Davies et al. do not explicitly teach the limitations, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the inventions of Cooper et al. and Cotte et al. with that of Davies et al. because such a combination would provide the users of Davies et al. with the benefit of an input device using scanning technology that has a zero footprint of space consumed on the surface of a workstation (Cotte) and a method and system for assigning a meaningful user-selected file label to files which uses existing peripheral devices (Cooper).

Regarding dependent claim 6:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cooper, col. 3, line 23 through col. 4, line 59, teaching specified storage locations.

Although Davies et al. do not explicitly teach the limitations, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the inventions of Cooper et al. and Cotte et al. with that of Davies et al. because such a combination would provide the users of Davies et al. with the benefit of an input device using scanning technology that has a zero footprint of space consumed on the surface

of a workstation (Cotte) and a method and system for assigning a meaningful user-selected file label to files which uses existing peripheral devices (Cooper).

Regarding dependent claim 7:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cooper, col. 1, line 8 through col. 14, line 11, specifically, col. 10, lines 13-44, and col. 11, lines 5-12, teaching file manipulation.

Although Davies et al. do not explicitly teach the limitations, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the inventions of Cooper et al. and Cotte et al. with that of Davies et al. because such a combination would provide the users of Davies et al. with the benefit of an input device using scanning technology that has a zero footprint of space consumed on the surface of a workstation (Cotte) and a method and system for assigning a meaningful user-selected file label to files which uses existing peripheral devices (Cooper).

Regarding dependent claim 8:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cooper, col. 15, lines 1-4 teaching updating the index.

Although Davies et al. do not explicitly teach the limitations, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the inventions of Cooper et al. and Cotte et al. with that of Davies et al. because such a combination would provide the users of Davies et al. with the benefit of an input device

using scanning technology that has a zero footprint of space consumed on the surface of a workstation (Cotte) and a method and system for assigning a meaningful user-selected file label to files which uses existing peripheral devices (Cooper).

Regarding dependent claim 9:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cooper, col. 15, lines 7-10 teaching storing the new file.

Although Davies et al. do not explicitly teach the limitations, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the inventions of Cooper et al. and Cotte et al. with that of Davies et al. because such a combination would provide the users of Davies et al. with the benefit of an input device using scanning technology that has a zero footprint of space consumed on the surface of a workstation (Cotte) and a method and system for assigning a meaningful user-selected file label to files which uses existing peripheral devices (Cooper).

Regarding dependent claim 10:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. Cooper, col. 1, line 8 through col. 14, line 11, teaching updating the coversheet and locations appropriate to the documents identified thereon.

Although Davies et al. do not explicitly teach the limitations, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the inventions of Cooper et al. and Cotte et al. with that of Davies et al. because such a

combination would provide the users of Davies et al. with the benefit of an input device using scanning technology that has a zero footprint of space consumed on the surface of a workstation (Cotte) and a method and system for assigning a meaningful user-selected file label to files which uses existing peripheral devices (Cooper).

Regarding dependent claim 11:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cooper, Figure 13, teaching location and action stickers.

Although Davies et al. do not explicitly teach the limitations, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the inventions of Cooper et al. and Cotte et al. with that of Davies et al. because such a combination would provide the users of Davies et al. with the benefit of an input device using scanning technology that has a zero footprint of space consumed on the surface of a workstation (Cotte) and a method and system for assigning a meaningful user-selected file label to files which uses existing peripheral devices (Cooper).

Regarding dependent claim 12:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cotte, col. 2, line 29 through col. 3, line 54, teaching multiple stickers and multiple “hot zones” as proximate locations for stickers to be read in relation to each other.

Although Davies et al. do not explicitly teach the limitations, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the

inventions of Cooper et al. and Cotte et al. with that of Davies et al. because such a combination would provide the users of Davies et al. with the benefit of an input device using scanning technology that has a zero footprint of space consumed on the surface of a workstation (Cotte) and a method and system for assigning a meaningful user-selected file label to files which uses existing peripheral devices (Cooper).

Regarding dependent claim 13:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cotte, col. 2, line 29 through col. 3, line 54, specifically col. 18, line 64 through col. 19, line 35, teaching the use of pointers with stickers.

Although Davies et al. do not explicitly teach the limitations, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the inventions of Cooper et al. and Cotte et al. with that of Davies et al. because such a combination would provide the users of Davies et al. with the benefit of an input device using scanning technology that has a zero footprint of space consumed on the surface of a workstation (Cotte) and a method and system for assigning a meaningful user-selected file label to files which uses existing peripheral devices (Cooper).

Regarding dependent claim 14:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cotte, col. 2, line 29 through col. 3, line 54, specifically Figures 26 through 30, and col. 11, line 24 through col. 13, line 38, teaching the use of "hot zones" for location, along with

multiple actions stickers and pointers.

Although Davies et al. do not explicitly teach the limitations, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the inventions of Cooper et al. and Cotte et al. with that of Davies et al. because such a combination would provide the users of Davies et al. with the benefit of an input device using scanning technology that has a zero footprint of space consumed on the surface of a workstation (Cotte) and a method and system for assigning a meaningful user-selected file label to files which uses existing peripheral devices (Cooper).

Regarding dependent claim 15:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cotte, col. 2, line 29 through col. 3, line 54, specifically Figures 26 through 30, and col. 11, line 24 through col. 13, line 38, teaching location of the sticker or icon. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to associate location with a coordinate. See also, Cooper, col. 10, lines 45-60.

Although Davies et al. do not explicitly teach the limitations, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the inventions of Cooper et al. and Cotte et al. with that of Davies et al. because such a combination would provide the users of Davies et al. with the benefit of an input device using scanning technology that has a zero footprint of space consumed on the surface of a workstation (Cotte) and a method and system for assigning a meaningful user-selected file label to files which uses existing peripheral devices (Cooper).

Regarding dependent claim 16:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cooper, figures 12 ad 13, teaching a list.

Although Davies et al. do not explicitly teach the limitations, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the inventions of Cooper et al. and Cotte et al. with that of Davies et al. because such a combination would provide the users of Davies et al. with the benefit of an input device using scanning technology that has a zero footprint of space consumed on the surface of a workstation (Cotte) and a method and system for assigning a meaningful user-selected file label to files which uses existing peripheral devices (Cooper).

Regarding dependent claim 17:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. The Examiner takes official notice of the fact that "thumbnail" images were a well known and widely used icons representing software applications and functions and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a thumbnail representation of a document on a document image index coversheet for purposes of giving visual cues to the user as to the content of the documents represented. See, Bloomberg (U.S. Patent 5,761,686, issued June 2, 1998), col. 3, lines 7-31, teaching that the use of thumbnail images as icons representing documents in applications and functions was well known in the art at the time of the invention.

Although Davies et al. do not explicitly teach the limitations, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the inventions of Cooper et al. and Cotte et al. with that of Davies et al. because such a combination would provide the users of Davies et al. with the benefit of an input device using scanning technology that has a zero footprint of space consumed on the surface of a workstation (Cotte) and a method and system for assigning a meaningful user-selected file label to files which uses existing peripheral devices (Cooper).

Regarding dependent claim 18:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cooper, col. 1, line 8 through col. 14, line 11, teaching the use of icons on coversheets.

Although Davies et al. do not explicitly teach the limitations, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the inventions of Cooper et al. and Cotte et al. with that of Davies et al. because such a combination would provide the users of Davies et al. with the benefit of an input device using scanning technology that has a zero footprint of space consumed on the surface of a workstation (Cotte) and a method and system for assigning a meaningful user-selected file label to files which uses existing peripheral devices (Cooper).

Regarding dependent claim 21:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cotte, col. 10, line 19 through col. 23, line 25, teaching the use of first and second stickers.

See also, Cooper, figures 12 and 13, teaching multiple documents on a coversheet.

Although Davies et al. do not explicitly teach the limitations, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the inventions of Cooper et al. and Cotte et al. with that of Davies et al. because such a combination would provide the users of Davies et al. with the benefit of an input device using scanning technology that has a zero footprint of space consumed on the surface of a workstation (Cotte) and a method and system for assigning a meaningful user-selected file label to files which uses existing peripheral devices (Cooper).

Regarding dependent claim 22:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cooper, col. 3, line 23 through col. 4, line 59, teaching that a document to be retrieved from a storage device by a coversheet need not necessarily be an electronic document.

Although Davies et al. do not explicitly teach the limitations, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the inventions of Cooper et al. and Cotte et al. with that of Davies et al. because such a combination would provide the users of Davies et al. with the benefit of an input device using scanning technology that has a zero footprint of space consumed on the surface of a workstation (Cotte) and a method and system for assigning a meaningful user-selected file label to files which uses existing peripheral devices (Cooper).

Regarding dependent claim 23:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cotte, figures 28 and 30 teaching multiple actions.

Although Davies et al. do not explicitly teach the limitations, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the inventions of Cooper et al. and Cotte et al. with that of Davies et al. because such a combination would provide the users of Davies et al. with the benefit of an input device using scanning technology that has a zero footprint of space consumed on the surface of a workstation (Cotte) and a method and system for assigning a meaningful user-selected file label to files which uses existing peripheral devices (Cooper).

Regarding dependent claim 24:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cooper, col. 9, line 61 through col. 11, line 54, teaching “clipping” as a sub-collection and performing actions user designated actions.

Although Davies et al. do not explicitly teach the limitations, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the inventions of Cooper et al. and Cotte et al. with that of Davies et al. because such a combination would provide the users of Davies et al. with the benefit of an input device using scanning technology that has a zero footprint of space consumed on the surface of a workstation (Cotte) and a method and system for assigning a meaningful user-selected file label to files which uses existing peripheral devices (Cooper).

Regarding dependent claim 25:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cotte, col. 10, line 19 through col. 23, line 25. See also, Cooper, col. 11, lines 13-31, teaching ordering of actions.

Although Davies et al. do not explicitly teach the limitations, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the inventions of Cooper et al. and Cotte et al. with that of Davies et al. because such a combination would provide the users of Davies et al. with the benefit of an input device using scanning technology that has a zero footprint of space consumed on the surface of a workstation (Cotte) and a method and system for assigning a meaningful user-selected file label to files which uses existing peripheral devices (Cooper).

Regarding dependent claim 26:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cotte, col. 10, line 19 through col. 23, line 25. See also, Cooper, col. 10, line 19 through col. 23, line 25, teaching ordering of actions, the actions being sorted according to identification order on the coversheet.

Although Davies et al. do not explicitly teach the limitations, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the inventions of Cooper et al. and Cotte et al. with that of Davies et al. because such a combination would provide the users of Davies et al. with the benefit of an input device using scanning technology that has a zero footprint of space consumed on the surface

of a workstation (Cotte) and a method and system for assigning a meaningful user-selected file label to files which uses existing peripheral devices (Cooper).

Regarding dependent claim 33:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cooper, col. 1, line 8 through col. 14, line 11, specifically, col. 13, lines 44-57, teaching receipt of the image index from another computer, which includes via e-mail.

Although Davies et al. do not explicitly teach the limitations, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the inventions of Cooper et al. and Cotte et al. with that of Davies et al. because such a combination would provide the users of Davies et al. with the benefit of an input device using scanning technology that has a zero footprint of space consumed on the surface of a workstation (Cotte) and a method and system for assigning a meaningful user-selected file label to files which uses existing peripheral devices (Cooper).

Regarding dependent claim 34:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cooper, col. 1, line 8 through col. 14, line 11, specifically, col. 13, lines 44-57, teaching receipt of the image of the document via fax.

Although Davies et al. do not explicitly teach the limitations, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the inventions of Cooper et al. and Cotte et al. with that of Davies et al. because such a

combination would provide the users of Davies et al. with the benefit of an input device using scanning technology that has a zero footprint of space consumed on the surface of a workstation (Cotte) and a method and system for assigning a meaningful user-selected file label to files which uses existing peripheral devices (Cooper).

Regarding dependent claim 40:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cooper, figure 10, teaching a document location.

Although Davies et al. do not explicitly teach the limitations, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the inventions of Cooper et al. and Cotte et al. with that of Davies et al. because such a combination would provide the users of Davies et al. with the benefit of an input device using scanning technology that has a zero footprint of space consumed on the surface of a workstation (Cotte) and a method and system for assigning a meaningful user-selected file label to files which uses existing peripheral devices (Cooper).

Regarding dependent claim 41:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cotte, col. 10, line 19 through col. 23, line 25, and Cooper, col. 1, line 8 through col. 14, line 11, teaching accessing a document from storage before performing operations on the document.

Although Davies et al. do not explicitly teach the limitations, it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the inventions of Cooper et al. and Cotte et al. with that of Davies et al. because such a combination would provide the users of Davies et al. with the benefit of an input device using scanning technology that has a zero footprint of space consumed on the surface of a workstation (Cotte) and a method and system for assigning a meaningful user-selected file label to files which uses existing peripheral devices (Cooper).

Regarding claims 46 – 53, 56 – 58, 61, 62, 65 – 72, and 75 – 79, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claims 3 – 10 and 22 – 25 and are rejected along the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-79 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan Hillery whose telephone number is (571) 272-4091. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F, 10:30 a.m. - 7:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

NH


Heather R. Herndon
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100